

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on May 18, 2007, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1-10, 13-15, 17, 19-21, 23 and 25 are amended. Claims 1-25 are pending in this application.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 9, 12, 13, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens (U.S. Pat. No. 5,380,046) in view of Smith (U.S. Pat. No. 5,410,827) and Moraw et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,324,421).

Claims 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens as modified by Smith and Moraw as applied to claims 1, 2, 9, 12, 13, 23 and 24 above and further in view of Killey (U.S. Pat. No. 5,342,672).

Claims 4, 6-8, 10, 11, 14-16, and 19-21 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens as modified by Smith and Moraw as applied to claims 1, 2, 9, 12, 13, 23 and 24 above and further in view of McConville et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,968,063).

Claims 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens as modified by Smith and Moraw et al. as applied to claims 1, 2, 9, 12, 13, 23 and 24 above and further in view of Killey and McConville et al.

Applicant has amended claims 1-10, 13-15, 17, 19-21, 23 and 25 to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter. Insofar as the rejection is applicable to claims 1-10, 13-15, 17, 19-21, 23 and 25 as amended, Applicant respectfully traverses all the rejected claims as follows.

Applicant respectfully submits that the documents cited in the Final Office Action do not teach or suggest all the elements recited in independent claims 1, 23 and 24. For example, Applicant is unable find in combination of Stephens, Smith and/or Moraw a transparent data sheet that includes a transparent durable layer, a transparent fragile layer, and at least one security feature included in one of the transparent durable layer and the transparent fragile layer, where the two layers are laminated together and the transparent

fragile layer is detectibly damaged after an attempt to tamper with the transparent data sheet, as recited in claim 1.

Similarly, Applicant is unable find in the combination of Stephens, Smith and/or Moraw a teaching or a suggestion of a process for manufacturing a transparent data sheet that includes providing a transparent fragile layer having a printable surface, providing a transparent durable layer, providing instructions to print on the printable surface of the transparent fragile layer; and assembling the transparent fragile layer and the transparent durable layer into the transparent data sheet, such that upon assembly, the two layers are laminated together, as recited in claim 23. Finally, Applicant is unable find in the combination of Stephens, Smith and/or Moraw a teaching or a suggestion of a process of manufacturing a transparent data sheet that includes printing identification information onto a surface of a first layer and laminating the printed surface of the first layer to another layer, wherein both layers are optically transparent and one layer is more fragile than the other, as recited in claim 24.

Based on the forgoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection for independent claims 1, 23 and 24, as well as those claims which depend therefrom is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the applicants' below signed attorney or Melissa E. Buss, Esq. at (651) 733-0649 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Sept. 18, 2007 By: Joseph C. Huebsch
Date Joseph C. Huebsch, Reg. No.: 42,673
Telephone No.: (612) 236-0122